

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 28, 2006, claims 1-5 and 7-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 112. Additionally, the remaining claims have been rejected under either 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103 over East. Applicant submits that the claims as now drafted clearly distinguish over East.

First, a brief review of some of the pertinent features of the present invention is believed to be helpful. As explained at page 1 of the present specification, personalization refers to the settings, options, preferences, privileges, etc., such that a computer will “be tailored to a particular user and/or subscriber”. Generally, the personalization information is the information unique to a particular user’s computer, selected largely by that user, to configure his own operating environment.

If a computer is replaced or added, the personalization of the new or added system is often difficult and time consuming. For example, undoubtedly, the Examiner at some point in his career has had a new PC installed. The new PC never behaves like the old PC, because all the parameters such as default printer, screen saver, default email editor, etc. has to be placed on the new computer. In short, taking a new computer out of a box and installing it to replace a prior computer does NOT result in the new computer looking and feeling to the user like his old one. Rather, to get the look and feel of the new computer the same, a relatively large amount of work is required to “personalize” the new computer so it looks like the old one.

When a network consists of numerous client computers, there are also one or more servers. The servers also are typically personalized, and thus, if replaced, the same problem exists.

The present invention solves this problem by gathering and storing the personalization

information for the client, and also for the servers. The personalization information is sent to a secondary server. When a particular client is replaced, the new generic hardware can be automatically personalized. If, for example, user X replaces his PC, the personalization information that has previously been gathered from the old PC can be sent from the secondary server to a server associated with the client, and from that server to the client. In this way, the look and feel of the new replaced client will be substantially identical to the look and feel of the old PC that has been replaced.

A similar methodology may be used to personalize the server from the secondary server should the need arise. Thus, all of the typical administrative effort to do the personalization when a computer is replaced is largely eliminated. Of course, the personalization information is in fact personal, and thus, may be different for each client and server. This is summarized, for example, at page 4 and Figures 2-3 of the present application.

Claim 1 now calls for gathering personalization information from plural clients and a first server, storing the information at a second server, determining that a new client computer is intended to replace a particular original client computer, and then propagating the personalization information from the second server, through the first server, to the new client to personalize it in the same manner as the original client. East does not show such a system.

East does not teach gathering personalization information from computers and then configuring new ones similarly. Instead, East teaches that software updates and other information can be propagated through a network from an administrator, down to the client computers, using a hierarchical method. (See, e.g.; Abstract and Paragraph 8).

In fact, East's general methodology of propagating *the same* information to many computers, in a hierarchical fashion, actually, in several specific places, explicitly teaches away

from the present claims. Each of the plural manners in which East teaches away from the present invention is discussed below.

First, it is clear that East can not propagate personalization information, which is unique to a particular user. As explained a paragraph 8 of East, his system depends heavily on the ability to send the information once from an administrative server to plural remote servers, and then have the information duplicated at the plural remote servers and sent to various clients. It is clear that East is discussing bulk distribution of the same information to many client computers, NOT transmission of each client computer's personal preferences, etc. to a particular computer so that computer can be personalized. Indeed, it would make no sense whatsoever to send one user's personal configuration preferences to large numbers of other users and servers, each of whom would presumably have their own personalization configurations.

Second, East merely distributes updates and configuration information selected by a master administrator. (See, e.g. Par. 7). East teaches away from the presently claimed method of "gathering personalization" information and then using it to personalize a newly installed computer. When new client computers are added to the network, instead of personalizing them with the personalization information from a prior computer that the new computer replaces, as the present application claims, any and all new clients are personalized by East with a ***standard, default*** configuration. (Par. 60). In fact, if the client computer is not compatible with a default configuration, then it simply has to be deselected and can not be used. (Par. 59). This is an affirmative teaching away from applicant's system, which gathers the personalization information from client computers and servers and personalizes a newly installed generic server or client with the previously gathered information to match the machine being replaced.

In short, East is a system wherein an administrative manager determines the proper

software updates and possibly other configuration parameters for groups of client computers, and then efficiently distributes that same information in accordance with East's hierarchical parallel distribution methods. Presumably, whatever personal settings are associated with each particular client would be configured by the user, conventionally, as this issue is mentioned nowhere in East. If a user got a new computer, it would have a default configuration at best.

Because East does not teach the limitations of claim 1 relating to gathering personalization information and then personalizing a replacement computer, applicants respectfully submit that the present claim 1 should be passed to allowance.

Dependant claims 2-5 are believed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Additionally, claim 4 requires that the first server can not personalize a client until after said server is personalized. Applicant's respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that this is taught by East. In East, the server and client are not personalized at all, because only the same information can be sent to both. (Par. 58-60). The present claim 5 has been amended to clarify that the first server is first personalized with first information, and the client is thereafter personalized by that first server with *different* information. This is neither taught nor implied by East, which specifically and repeatedly notes that all the information used to configure the computers is the same, and which in fact, relies heavily on that in order to duplicate and efficiently distribute this same information to many parties.(e.g.; Par. 8, 9).

As for the remaining claims, while worded slightly differently, each includes at least one of the major distinctions discussed above with respect to East. Moreover, with respect to the rejections of the dependant claims under 35 USC 103, all of those rejections should be withdrawn in view of the distinctions between East and the claims discussed above. Finally, with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 112, the claim language giving rise to the rejections

has been removed, and thus, all rejections are now believed to be overcome.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: September 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jeffrey I. Kaplan

Registration No.: 34,356

KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER LLP

900 Route 9 North, Suite 504

Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095

(732) 634-7634

*Attorneys for Applicant*